COMPARING STATE PORTFOLIO STANDARDS AND SYSTEM-BENEFITS CHARGES UNDER RESTRUCTURING

Ryan Wiser
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Kevin Porter
National Renewable Energy Laboratory

Mark Bolinger
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

October 23, 2000

Table 1. RPS Policies Established at the State Level Under Restructuring

State	Purchase Requirement
Arizona	0.2% in 2001, rising by 0.2%/yr to 1% in 2005, and to 1.05% in 2006, then to 1.1% from 2007 to 2012. Competitive retail suppliers are exempt until 2004. Utility distribution companies may recover costs of the RPS through reallocating existing SBC accounts for DSM and partly through environmental portfolio surcharge.
Connecticut	Class I or II Technologies: 5.5% in 2000, 6% in 2005, 7% in 2009 and thereafter. Class I Technologies: 0.5% in 2000 + 0.25%/yr to 1% in 2002, 6% in 2009 and thereafter. Revised law in 1999 clarifies that standard is energy based, not capacity based and allows individual suppliers to petition PUC for delay of RPS targets of up to 2 years. PUC has denied at least one petition for delay. PUC has established that RPS shall not apply to standard offer service, but this decision is under appeal
Maine	30% of retail sales in 2000 and thereafter as condition of licensing. PUC will revisit RPS within 5 years after retail competition. PUC has proposed to eliminate RPS in favor of an SBC.
Massachusetts	1% of sales to end-use customers from new renewables in 2003 or 1 year after any renewable is within 10% of average spot-market price, +0.5%/yr to 4% in 2009, and +1%/yr increase thereafter until date determined by Division of Energy Resources (DOER). Preliminary RPS design proposal (June 2000) does not propose standard for existing renewables - DOER plans to monitor market and adopt standard if there is significant attrition of renewables.
Nevada	0.2% of total Nevada consumption as of January 1, 2001. Increases by 0.2% biannually until reaches 1%. 50% of requirement from solar. Sierra Pacific given special treatment. Rural electric coops, general improvement districts, and others are exempted. With retail competition delay, it is also possible that RPS will be delayed.
New Jersey	Class I of II Technologies: 2.5% when BPU adopts interim standards with no sunset. Class I Technologies: 0.5% in 2001, 1% in 2006, +0.5%/yr to 4% in 2012.
New Mexico	Up to 5% for standard offer service by 2002 if it can be shown renewable resources are available in New Mexico and if cost of standard offer service does not increase by more than 1 mill/kWh. Purchase requirement could initially start at lower level if above conditions not met.
Pennsylvania	For PECO, West Penn, and PP&L, 20% of residential consumers served by competitive default provider: 2% in 2001, rising 0.5%/year. For GPU, 0.2% in 2001 for 20% of customers, 40% of customers in 2002, 60% in 2003, 80% in 2004 and thereafter.
Texas	Legislation establishes renewable energy capacity targets: 1280 MW by 2003 increasing to 2880 MW by 2009 (880 MW of which is existing generation). RPS rule translates capacity targets into percentage energy purchase requirements.
Wisconsin	0.5% by 2001, increasing to 2.2% by 2011 (0.6% can come from facilities installed before 1998).

Table 1. RPS Policies Established at the State Level Under Restructuring (continued)

State	Resource Eligibility	Credit Trading
Arizona	2001—at least 50% solar electric—remainder from R&D, solar hot water, or other in-state landfill gas, wind and biomass. R&D investments can reduce RPS target by up to 10% 2002-2003—same as 2001 except R&D investments can reduce RPS target by up to 5% 2004-2012—at least 60% solar electric—remainder from solar hot water and in-state landfill gas, wind and biomass	To be determined
Connecticut	Class I: solar, wind, new sustainable biomass, landfill gas, and fuel cells; Class II: licensed hydro, MSW, other biomass	Law allows suppliers to satisfy RPS by participating in credit trading program approved by the state, but state PUC has indicated it has no plans to establish a credit trading program; may allow private actors to develop credit trading system
Maine	Fuel cells, tidal, solar, wind, geothermal, hydro, biomass, and MSW (under 100 MW); high efficiency cogeneration of any size; resource supply under this definition far exceeds RPS-driven demand	PUC decided against credit trading to maintain consistency with regional disclosure tracking systems
Massachusetts	Solar, wind, ocean thermal, wave, or tidal, fuel cells using renewable fuels, landfill gas, waste-to-energy, hydro, and low-emission, advanced biomass; waste-to-energy and hydro cannot count toward new standard; new renewables defined as those that begin commercial operation or represent an increase in capacity at an existing facility after December 31, 1997; DOER can add technologies after hearings	Credit trading would require subsequent legislative approval; DOER participating in negotiations over the establishment of a regional tradable certificates system
Nevada	50% from new solar electric or solar thermal that offsets electric use; new defined as installed and commenced operations after July 1, 1997; 50% from wind, solar, geothermal, and biomass energy resources in Nevada that are naturally regenerated	Will be based on renewable energy credits, if applicable; Commission exploring adoption of credit trading system
New Jersey	Class I: solar, PV, wind, fuel cells, geothermal, wave or tidal, and methane gas from landfills or a biomass facility, provided that the biomass is cultivated and harvested in a sustainable manner; Class II: hydro and resource recovery facilities in states with retail competition; draft RPS rule would limit hydro to under 30 MW	Electric suppliers may satisfy the RPS by participating in a renewable energy credit trading program approved by the Board of Public Utilities (BPU); draft RPS rule does not establish such a system
New Mexico	Wind, solar, geothermal, biomass, hydro, and fuel cells	Not addressed
Pennsylvania	Unspecified	Unspecified
Texas	Solar, wind, geothermal, hydro, wave, tidal, biomass, biomass-based waste products, landfill gas	Texas is first state to establish credit trading program; ERCOT ISO selected as the program administrator
Wisconsin	Wind, solar, biomass, geothermal, tidal, fuel cells that use renewable fuel, hydro under 60 MW; eligibility may be expanded by PUC	Legislation allows renewable purchases to be satisfied through the purchase of renewable energy credits; proposed rule would reward credits for renewable energy generation over RPS requirement

Table 1. RPS Policies Established at the State Level Under Restructuring (continued)

State	Compliance Verification	Penalties
Arizona	PUC order suggests a 12 month compliance period	30 cents/kWh starting in 2004; proceeds go to solar electric fund to finance solar facilities for schools, cities, counties or state agencies
Connecticut	License application projection requirements; yearly compliance periods beginning July 1; no later than October 1 of each year, supplier must submit to DPUC documentation demonstrating that the supplier complied with the RPS in the previous 12 months based on information from the ISO and that no 'double counting' has occurred	Must meet RPS to be licensed; flexible penalties for failing to comply with license conditions include license revocation or suspension, a prohibition from accepting new customers, or civil penalties
Maine	Must be met over 12-month periods; general description of how RPS will be met at licensing; supplier files annual report by May 1 of each year demonstrating compliance for previous year and that no "double counting" has occurred; leaves flexibility in amount and type of information required and puts burden on supplier; may consider certified audit as a form of compliance at a later date; requires officer certification that RPS has been met and that renewables have not been "double counted"; Commission may conduct periodic audits to verify compliance	Variety of possible sanctions at discretion of Commission including license revocation, monetary penalties, and other appropriate penalties; allows voluntary payment into renewables R&D fund to avoid license revocation
Massachusetts	Legislation and DOER contemplate 12-month compliance period; DOER working on regional tradable certificates system that would help determine RPS compliance; retail supplier must submit annual report to DOER demonstrating compliance	DOER has considered multiple possible penalties for non-compliance, but no decisions have yet been made; imposition of penalties may require subsequent legislative approval, but DOER considering imposition of financial sanctions through arrangement with PUC; penalty could be set at three times average market value of new renewables generation, or at a fixed amount that may be periodically revised by DOER
Nevada	At end of each calendar year, each supplier must submit report to Commission to verify compliance	Compliance required to maintain license; penalties include license suspension and revocation; exploring other approaches
New Jersey	Not addressed in legislation, but draft rule would apply 12-month compliance period; compliance filings due April 1 for previous year, with independent verification from an auditor	Draft RPS rule would require non-complying retailers to purchase the required amount of renewables and possibly face financial penalties and/or license revocation or suspension
New Mexico	To be determined	Not addressed
Pennsylvania	Unspecified	Unspecified
Texas	Yearly compliance filings, with 3-month settlement period at end of compliance year; RPS rule establishes the ERCOT ISO to run renewable energy credit registry to track and verify renewable energy credit transactions	Penalty for noncompliance is the lesser of 5 cents/kWh or 200% of the average market value of renewable energy credits; under certain circumstances, penalty may not be assessed
Wisconsin	Yearly compliance filings with 3-month settlement period at end of each compliance year; compliance filings due April 15; total retail sales determined by calculating a 3-year rolling average of an electric power provider's retail sales	Penalty of $5,000 - $500,000 is allowed in legislation

Table 1. RPS Policies Established at the State Level Under Restructuring (continued)

State	Cost Cap	Credit Multipliers	Out of State Renewable Eligibility
Arizona	No explicit cap but penalty acts as de facto cap	Various multipliers for early installation before 2003; in-state installation or content; distributed solar; net metering; and utility green pricing programs; credit multipliers are additive, to maximum of 2.0 through 2003; retail provider can offset ½ of RPS requirement in 2001, ¼ of requirement in 2002 and 2003 if they invest in Arizona solar manufacturing facility.	Out-of-state solar appears eligible; landfill gas, wind and biomass must be in-state
Connecticut	No explicit cap	None	Eligible
Maine	No explicit cap but penalty and flexibility conditions should reduce cost fluctuations	None	Eligible; energy must be delivered to the ISO-NE control area and meet load in New England, or may in any way satisfy load within the ISO-NE control area (for generation under 5 MW); same provisions for the Maritimes control area
Massachusetts	Not included in legislation; DOER not inclined to include	None	Eligible
Nevada	Not included in legislation	None	Not eligible
New Jersey	None included in legislation or draft rule	None	Eligible generally; Class II technologies must come from states open to retail competition
New Mexico	Overall cap on cost of RPS of 1 mill/kWh	None	Not eligible
Pennsylvania	None included in legislation	Unspecified	Unspecified
Texas	None explicit, but implicit cap of 5 cents/kWh for renewable energy credits	None	Not eligible unless dedicated transmission line into the state
Wisconsin	None	None	Eligible

Table 1. RPS Policies Established at the State Level Under Restructuring (continued)

State	Company- or Product-Based	Treatment of Hybrid Generators	Solar Thermal Eligibility	Self-Generation
Arizona	Company-based	Not determined yet	Yes	Yes, for solar
Connecticut	Company-based	Not entirely clear; probably only renewables-portion eligible	No	No provisions in legislation; RPS rule would seem to preclude; possibly eligible if credit trading system developed
Maine	Revision to law in May 1999 makes standard effectively product-based	Only qualified renewable and cogen output are eligible from multi-fuel facilities	No	Not eligible
Massachusetts	Legislation may imply company-based but DOER also considering product-based	Not entirely clear; DOER proposal is for renewables-portion to be eligible	No	No provisions in legislation; DOER is advocating eligibility of self-generation in tradable certificates system
Nevada	Not addressed though legislation may imply company-based	Not yet addressed; assume that only renewable-fraction qualifies	Yes	Issue being explored by Commission; seems likely to be inclusive
New Jersey	Legislation may imply company-based but not yet decided	Not entirely clear; probably only renewables-portion eligible	No	No provisions in legislation; draft RPS rule would seem to preclude; possibly eligible if credit trading system developed
New Mexico	Product-based; utilities can offer renewable energy tariff but cannot count these sales towards 5% standard	Not addressed	Not addressed	Not addressed
Pennsylvania	Unspecified	Unspecified	Unspecified	Unspecified
Texas	Company-based	Not eligible unless solar hybrid (then only renewables fraction is eligible)	Eligible if meets metering requirements	Eligible if meets metering requirements
Wisconsin	Legislation may imply company-based	Renewables portion is eligible	No	Legislation does not specify, but would appear to preclude

Table 1. RPS Policies Established at the State Level Under Restructuring (continued)

State	Additional Flexibility Mechanisms	Status
Arizona	Waivers; use of SBC funds for RPS compliance costs; credit multipliers; utility distribution companies without a renewable energy program may request a waiver because of "extreme circumstances"	Commission order in April 2000; rulemaking later in 2000; comprehensive review of policy in 2003 to determine RPS status and level from 2004 onward
Connecticut	Other approaches to verifying compliance may be accepted by PUC; 2 year delay of compliance may be requested	Restructuring legislation in 1998; licensing regulations in 1998 established certain RPS provisions; revisions to law in 1999; RPS begins July 1, 2000
Maine	If service begins less than 6 months prior to December 31, compliance period extends beyond the year to the second December 31; advisory ruling provision allows interested parties to request ruling on whether a particular facility satisfies the eligibility requirements; extra year "cure period" for suppliers that obtain 20% - 30% of eligible resources; Commission may extend cure period for those who can demonstrate an ownership interest or entitlement in an eligible new facility that will come on line within 2 years; can waive all penalties with a showing that a supplier could not meet RPS because of market conditions	Restructuring legislation in 1997; PUC worked out design details in 1998; revisions to RPS law in May 1999; RPS took effect March 1, 2000; PUC considering proposing legislation to drop RPS in favor of SBC
Massachusetts	DOER considering multiple flexibility mechanisms, including allowance for early compliance, credit banking, 3-month settlement period at end of each compliance period, etc.	Restructuring legislation in 1997; DOER released preliminary proposal in June 2000 but working on regional tradable certificates program; new RPS begins in 2003
Nevada	None established yet; issue being explored by Commission	Restructuring legislation in 1997; PUC undertakes RPS investigation in 1999; PUC workshop and hearing in October 2000; investigation not yet complete; RPS slated to begin in 2001
New Jersey	None proposed in legislation; draft rule applies flexible penalties for non-compliance	Restructuring legislation in 1999; draft RPS rule in late 1999; final rule not yet released; RPS begins in 2001, at latest
New Mexico	RPS may be reduced if there are not enough renewable energy resources in the state; costs of standard offer service cannot increase by more than 1 mill/kWh	PUC order in May 2000; modified September 2000 to include cost cap; restructuring delayed until 2002
Pennsylvania	Unspecified	Legislation in 1996; individual utility settlements in 1998
Texas	Two year banking of renewable energy credits allowed; limited deficit banking also allowed in first 2 years; 3 month settlement period at end of each compliance year in which to purchase needed credits	Restructuring legislation in 1999; final RPS rule complete in 12/99; credit trading protocol being designed and implemented; RPS begins in 2002, with early compliance beginning in mid 2001
Wisconsin	Three month settlement period; total retail sales determined by calculating a 3-year rolling average of an electric power provider's retail sales; credit banking is allowed; unlimited credit life until claimed	RPS legislation established as part of state budget within a wholesale electricity reform measure in late 1999; proposed regulations subject of PUC hearing in July 2000

Table 2. SBC Policies Established at the State Level Under Restructuring

State	Level of Funding	Resource Eligibility
California	$135 million/year for 4 years beginning 1998; additional funds provided for renewable energy R&D; fund extended at $135 million/year adjusted for inflation and load growth through 2012	Non-utility, in-state solar, wind, biomass, geothermal, MSW, and small hydro (less than or equal to 30 MW)
Connecticut	Approx. $14 million/year in 2000; $30 million/year in 2004 and thereafter	Wind, solar, fuel cells, ocean, landfill gas and low-emission advanced biomass technologies.
Delaware	About $1.5 million/year for energy efficiency, with unspecified amount for renewables	To be determined
Illinois Fund #1 (statewide)	$5 million/year for 10 years beginning in 1999	Wind, solar thermal, PV, dedicated crop biomass and organic waste biomass, retrofit or expansion of existing hydro
Massachusetts	Averages $45 million/year for first 5 years, with roughly $10 million/year for pollution controls, debt service, or retirement for waste-to-energy facilities; continues at average of $25 million/year with no support for waste-to-energy	New solar, wind, ocean, advanced biomass, fuel cells; limited eligibility for waste-to-energy for first five years
Montana	$14 million/year for efficiency, renewables, and R&D from 1999-2003, at which point level will be re-evaluated; perhaps $2 million per year will be dedicated to renewables	Renewable generators constructed after January 1, 1999
New Jersey	Approx. $32 million from 2000-2007 with review after 8 years	Solar, wind, fuel cells, geothermal, wave or tidal, and methane gas or a biomass facility, provided that the biomass is cultivated and harvested in a sustainable manner
New Mexico	$4 million/year for renewables beginning in 2001; no definite expiration date, although restructuring law contemplates a revisiting of support for renewables at some later date	Solar, wind, hydro, geothermal, landfill gas, anaerobic digesters, and biomass-based fuel cells
New York	$17 million over three years for renewables, from 1999 through 2001; proposal to extend and increase funding level for 5 years	Wind, solar, biomass
Oregon	$8.7 million annually for 10 years beginning in 2001	Wind, waste, solar, geothermal, landfill gas, digester gas, energy crops, low-emission biomass based on solid organic fuels, and hydro facilities outside protected federal areas
Pennsylvania	PECO, PP&L, GPU, and West Penn settlements total approx. $55 million over 5 years, used for renewables, clean energy, energy efficiency and economic development that promotes clean energy; total renewables funding of perhaps $5 million per year; PECO/Unicom merger will result in another $20 million added to PECO SBC fund (see Table 3); renewable Energy Pilot Fund for low income customers raises $3.9 million/year for 2001-2002	PECO, PP&L, GPU, and West Penn funds not specific; Renewable Energy Pilot Fund mostly focused on solar (PV and hot water); one utility (West Penn) has proposal for small wind program
Rhode Island	Approx. $2 million/year for renewables from 1997-2001; reevaluate need for and size of SBC after 2001	Wind, solar, sustainable biomass, small hydro under 100 MW that does not require new dams
Wisconsin	Approx. $3 million per year; sunset review scheduled for 2004 or 2005	Eligible technologies include solar thermal, photovoltaics, wind, geothermal, biomass, fuel cells powered by renewables, and hydro under 60 MW; intends to focus on customer-side applications

Table 2. SBC Policies Established at the State Level Under Restructuring (continued)

State	Fund Distribution	Administration
California	For first 4 years: 45% used to support existing renewables; 30% to support new renewables; 10% to support solar and other emerging renewables; 15% to support green power market; distribution for 10 year extension not yet determined	California Energy Commission
Connecticut	Grants, direct or equity investments, contracts or other action that support research, development, manufacture, commercialization, deployment and installation of renewable technologies, and action that expand renewable expertise of individuals, businesses, and lending institutions; thus far, the fund is taking a venture-capital-like investment approach	Connecticut Innovations, Incorporated
Delaware	To be determined	Delaware Development Office, with assistance from state consumer advocate and energy office
Illinois Fund #1 (statewide)	Legislation allows grants, loans, and rebates, but the fund administrator so far has employed only grants and rebates	Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs
Massachusetts	Will focus on distributed generation, the competitive green power market, the renewable energy business sector, green buildings, and helping educational institutions develop renewable energy programs	Massachusetts Technology Collaborative
Montana	Utilities receive credit against SBC allocation for expenses on covered programs under the SBC; state administers remaining funds; large customers with loads of more than 1 MW must dedicate 0.9 mills/kWh, or $500,000, minus any amount they spend directly on energy efficiency or renewable energy	Utilities and large industrials, with remaining funds administered by state
New Jersey	Board of Public Utilities, in consultation with the Department of Environmental Protection, will determine fund distribution and allocation; BPU is considering two competing proposals, both generally modeled after California's SBC program	Board of Public Utilities governs program; detailed administration not determined
New Mexico	Half of funds to be distributed to solar and half to a bidding process for other renewables; funding recipients are limited to school districts and the governing entities of cities, towns, villages or counties	To be determined
New York	Funds competitively bid in technology-specific solicitations; co-funding of 50% or more is required; three wind projects totaling 27 MW in various stages of development; Niagara Mohawk has funded a fourth wind project with its own SBC funds; up to 300 PV projects will be installed (> 1 MW total), as well as co-firing of willow trees in a coal-fired plant	New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA)
Oregon	Not yet determined; preliminary ideas include a wind RFP and a customer credit on green power options	A new nonprofit organization will be created to run the program
Pennsylvania	PECO Fund has invested in green townhouse development, Energy Unlimited/Community Energy wind project, geothermal heat pump installation, and a manufacturer of PV-powered traffic control equipment, and has developed an unsecured consumer loan product for PV, solar hot water, fuel cells, geothermal heat pumps, and energy efficiency Renewable Energy Pilot Fund mostly dedicated to PV and solar hot water systems, although small wind systems are an eligible technology in West Penn's program	PECO: The Reinvestment Fund GPU/Penelec: The Community Foundation of the Alleghenies GPU/MetEd: Berks County Community Foundation PP&L: The Sustainable Energy Fund West Penn: not yet determined
Rhode Island	Funds renewable projects and programs through RFP process; funded resource studies in 1997; in 1998-2000, supported wind investigations, fuel cells, and PV projects; currently reassessing program and funding strategy in renewable energy	Rhode Island Renewable Energy Collaborative (RIREC) with oversight from state PUC
Wisconsin	Details not yet determined; grant solicitations are likely; focus will be on customer-sited generation with a business development and educational focus	Non-profit administrator will be selected to run the program

Table 2. SBC Policies Established at the State Level Under Restructuring (continued)

State	Status
California	Legislation in 1996. Fund distribution finalized in 1997; funds collected and distributed beginning 1998. *Existing Account* is supporting 259 facilities and 4000 MW. Bids for *New Account* incentive resulted in 55 projects and over 550 MW. Eleven projects are on-line (8 landfill gas, 2 wind, one geothermal). The CEC estimates that 13 projects will come on-line in 2000 and another 29 in 2001. Three projects (one wood residue, two landfill gas) have been cancelled. *Emerging Account* has resulted in 239 small projects (mostly PV) for total capacity of 1.24 MW, with another 1.44 MW in various stages of planning and development. Legislation signed in September 2000 extended the SBC fund for 10 years.
Connecticut	Legislation in 1998. Made first investment of $500,000 in March 2000 to the Connecticut Energy Co-op, a green power marketer that will also support the installation of home PV or solar thermal systems. Second investment in August 2000 to Solar Dynamics, Inc. to sell portable PV power generators (a spin-off of ASE Americas' Solar Power Companion product line). Also exploring on- and off-shore wind, fuel cells, and landfill gas.
Delaware	Fund collection began in October 1999. Implementation efforts just getting underway.
Illinois Fund #1 (statewide)	Legislation in 1997. Fund collection started in 1998 and distribution began in 1999. Has funded a number of PV systems of various sizes, mostly on commercial and community buildings. Has also funded a landfill gas project, and a few small solar thermal projects.
Massachusetts	Legislation in 1997. Distribution was on hold until lawsuit was resolved. Court ruled in favor of state in April 2000. Strategic plan released in June 2000. Currently working on a detailed operating plan. No projects have yet been funded.
Montana	Montana Power Company released wind RFP in 2000 and has approved a production incentive for 3 MW of a 23 MW project. MPC is also working with local non-profits and industry participants on several PV initiatives focused on demonstration projects. Rural cooperatives and Montana Dakota Utilities just getting started.
New Jersey	Legislation in 1999. NJ Board of Public Utilities considering two different fund proposals. One is from NRDC and six of the state's seven electric utilities; the other from the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocates and several other public interest groups.
New Mexico	Rulemaking just getting underway.
New York	PUC decision in 1998. Four wind projects over 30 MW in various stages of planning. Also sponsoring wind resource RFP; rooftop and commercial PV (> 1 MW total); and willow project for biomass co-firing. NYSERDA proposal to extend and increase SBC fund for 5 years.
Oregon	Legislation in 1999. Oregon PUC staff proposed draft rules in April 2000 for collecting SBC funds. Separately, a task force of state agencies and interested stakeholders has explored program administration and implementation issues with the PUC. In July 2000 PUC staff released a draft white paper outlining the structure of a new non-profit entity to administer the fund.
Pennsylvania	Legislation in 1996. Individual utility settlements in 1998. Only PECO fund is active, having invested $1.7 million through July 2000. PECO/Unicom merger will add $20 million to PECO fund. (see Table 3).
Rhode Island	Legislation in 1996. Some PV projects have been sponsored. Planned wind project failed to materialize because of poor economics and difficulties in acquiring a site. One fuel cell installed. Currently developing new programs.
Wisconsin	Legislation in 1999. Wisconsin Department of Administration must select non-profit administrator(s) and establish requirements and grant applications procedures.

Table 3. Other State Renewable Energy Funds Established Under Other Mechanisms Related to Restructuring (Utility Mergers, State Legislation, etc.)

State	Level of Funding	Resource Eligibility	Fund Distribution	Administration	Status/Other
Illinois Fund #2 (Commonwealth Edison)	$225 million; unspecified amount for renewable energy; in addition to renewables and energy efficiency, funds can also be used to support other energy-related programs that improve Illinois' environmental quality, wildlife habitat and natural areas preservation, the Illinois Citizens Utility Board, and clean coal initiatives	Clean energy technologies include solar, wind, biomass, and energy efficiency programs that reduce electricity consumption and prevent pollution	TBD, but preliminary indications are that it will provide venture capital support, grants, loans, and other incentives to projects that encourage the development of clean energy technologies	Illinois Clean Energy Community Foundation	Trustees have been appointed; program and grant guidelines expected by summer 2000
Illinois Fund #3 (City of Chicago)	$100 million over four years, created as part of a resolution to a franchise dispute with Commonwealth Edison; unspecified amount for renewable energy	TBD	TBD	TBD	$6 million purchase commitment used to attract PV manufacturer Spire Corporation to build a photovoltaics manufacturing plant on a redeveloped brownfield site on the west side of Chicago
Minnesota (Northern States Power service territory)	$4.5 million in 1999, rising to $8.5 million annually by 2003	Wind, solar, biomass, and run-of-river hydro with head of less than 66 feet	Grants for first year, then grants, production incentives, equity partnerships, loans and/or revolving loan fund	Six-person board of directors, with two representatives from Northern States Power, two from environmental groups, and two from consumer groups	Preference for renewable electric projects as opposed to R&D and commercialization; less preference also given to renewable energy projects that do not promote local economic development or are not yet commercially viable; projects sponsored by the Prairie Island Mdewankanton tribe may be given preference; NSP may also propose projects after the first year of the fund's operation, including projects to meet the wind and biomass legislative mandates; all projects must be approved by the Minnesota PUC, and NSP retains right of first refusal to purchase the electric power from any funded projects
New York Fund #2 (Long Island Power Authority)	$32 million over five years, 1999-2003, for energy efficiency, clean distributed energy, and renewable energy technologies	TBD	Only funded rebate program for small PV systems to date	Long Island Power Authority	Created in May 1999; LIPA has installed free PV systems on 30 homes
Pennsylvania (PECO/Unicom merger settlement)	$20 million over five years: $12 million for wind, $4 million for PV, $2.5 million for education, and $1.5 million to extend "core" PECO fund by 18 months; another $3.5 million goes directly to Community Energy to support its wind development	Wind and PV	Evaluating bids for a $6 million wind production incentive bid	The Reinvestment Fund ($20 million) Community Energy ($3.5 million)	Merger awaiting final regulatory approval